

**REMARKS**

I. Summary of Office Action

Applicants' independent claims 1, 20, 39, 57, and 58 were rejected as allegedly being obvious from Ellis et al. U.S. Patent Application Pub. 2008/0184315 ("Ellis") in view of Schein et al. U.S. Patent Application Pub. 2003/0005445 ("Schein").

II. Summary of Reply

Claims 1-26, 31-58, and 60-65 are pending. Applicants have amended claims 1, 2, 20, 39, 57, 58, 60, 61, 64, and 65 and added new claim 66 in order to more particularly define the invention. The amendments and new claim add no new matter and are fully supported by applicants' originally-filed application.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections set forth in the Office Action.

III. Reply to the Prior Art Rejections

Applicants' independent claims relate to customizing an advertisement. To customize the advertisement, a supplemental advertisement information item is selected from multiple possible advertisement information items based on a received advertisement and viewer profile information. The supplemental advertisement information item is then included in display of the customized advertisement. For example, a received Burger King advertisement may be customized to include an address of a Burger King local to a user. The address is selected from a multiple possible Burger King addresses based on a zip code retrieved from viewer profile information. A customized advertisement is then displayed that includes

both the received Burger King advertisement and the local Burger King address (see applicants' specification at page 63, line 23 through page 64, line 7).

Applicants respectfully submit that disclosure cannot be found in the Office Action's combination of Ellis and Schein for customizing an advertisement to include a supplemental advertisement information item that is selected from a plurality of advertisement information items, as claimed.

The Office Action states that Schein is silent on determining supplemental advertisement information based on a retrieved advertisement and viewer profile information, and states that Ellis instead shows this feature (*Office Action*, page 3). Specifically, the Office Action contends that Ellis's message of "[p]ress \* to receive a brochure describing this product" is displayed only if a user has previously provided their name and address information, which the Office Action contends to be equivalent to applicants' viewer profile information. Based on these interpretations, the Office Action concludes that Ellis's message is supplemental advertisement information determined based on viewer profile information, as claimed prior to the current amendments (*Office Action*, page 10).

However, in contrast to applicants' amended claims, the Office Action's combination of Ellis and Schein is capable of selecting a supplemental advertisement information item from at most one possible advertisement information item for display with a particular advertisement based on viewer profile information. This is because, according to the Office Action's interpretations described above, either Ellis's message of "[p]ress \* to receive a brochure describing this product" is displayed or

no message is displayed with a particular advertisement based on viewer profile information. Thus, a selection of Ellis's message represents, at most, a selection from one possible advertisement information item. Further, Ellis's message is described as being a "standard on-screen message" (Ellis, paragraph 230) and disclosure cannot be found in the cited portions of Ellis for including more than one version of Ellis's message with a particular advertisement. The cited portions of Ellis therefore describe selecting a supplemental advertisement information item from, at most, one possible advertisement information item for display with a particular advertisement based on viewer profile information. Ellis therefore does not remedy the Office Action's stated deficiencies in Schein, and the Office Action's combination of Ellis and Schein does not show or suggest applicants' claims 1, 20, 39, 57, and 58. Applicants respectfully submit therefore that claims 1, 20, 39, 57, and 58, and accordingly, all of their dependent claims, are patentable over the combination of Ellis and Schein.

IV. New Claim 66

Applicants have added new claim 66. Claim 66 depends from allowable independent claim 1, and is allowable for at least this reason.

V. Conclusion

The foregoing demonstrates that this application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration, entry of the proposed amendments, and prompt allowance of this application, are accordingly respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Saswat Misra/

---

Saswat Misra  
Reg. No. 64,254  
Agent for Applicants  
ROPES & GRAY LLP  
Customer No. 75563  
1211 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10036-8704  
Tel.: (212) 596-9000